- 1 - 12cr3587WOH

authorized by law, or is otherwise subject to collateral attack, may move the court which imposed the sentence to vacate, set aside or correct the sentence." A district court must summarily dismiss a § 2255 application "[i]f it plainly appears from the motion, any attached exhibits, and the record of prior proceedings that the moving party is not entitled to relief." Rule 4(b), Rules Governing Section 2255 Proceedings for the United States District courts. When this standard is satisfied, neither a hearing nor a response from the government is required. *See Marrow v. United States*, 772 F.2d 525, 526 (9th Cir. 1985).

RULING OF THE COURT

In this case, the record conclusively shows that the Defendant has waived his right to bring a § 2255 motion. In exchange for the Government's concessions in the plea agreement, the Defendant waived "to the full extent of the law, any right to appeal or to collaterally attack the conviction and sentence, except a post-conviction collateral attack based on a claim of ineffective assistance of counsel, unless the Court imposes a custodial sentence above the high end of the guideline range recommended by the Government pursuant to this agreement at the time of sentencing." (ECF No. 13 at 10). This waiver is clear, express and unequivocal. Plea agreements are contractual in nature, and their plain language will generally be enforced if the agreement is clear and unambiguous on its face. *United States v. Jeronimo*, 298 F.3d 1149, 1153 (9th Cir. 2005).

At the time of sentencing, the Government recommended an adjusted offense level of 13 and a resulting guideline range of 24-30 months. (ECF No. 23). The Government recommended a sentence of 24 months. (ECF No. 23). The Court imposed a sentence of 24 months. (ECF No. 28 at 2). Pursuant to the terms of the plea agreement, the Defendant waived his right to collaterally attack the sentence imposed.

Finally, the Defendant presents no grounds for relief under Section 2255. The Sentencing Reform Act gives the Bureau of Prisons the responsibility to "designate the place of the prisoner's imprisonment." 18 U.S.C. § 3621(b). *See United States v. Cubillos*, 91 F.3d 1342, 1344-45 (9th Cir. 1996). The Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit has rejected the assertion that an alien's equal protection rights are violated when he cannot be housed in a

- 2 - 12cr3587WQH

1	minimum security facility or a community correction center based upon his deportation status.
2	See McClean v. Crabtree, 173 F.3d 1176, 1185-86 (9th Cir. 1999). This Court has no
3	jurisdiction to correct or modify criminal judgment at this stage in the proceedings. See, Rule
4	35(a) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure.
5	IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the motion for time reduction by an inmate in federal
6	custody under 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (ECF No. 33) filed by the Defendant is denied.
7	DATED: April 19, 2013
8	WILLIAM Q. HAYES United States District Judge
9	United States District Judge
10	
11	
12 13	
13	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

Case 3:13-cv-00141-WQH Document 2 Filed 04/19/13 PageID.9 Page 3 of 3

- 3 - 12cr3587WQH